WORLD COMMUNISM IN REVIEW

BY

HENRY R. HUTTENBACK

PREFACE

BY

RICHARD CARDINAL CUSHING

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2021 with funding from
Columbia University Libraries

https://archive.org/details/worldcommunismin00hutt

Pam
Communism

OCT 31 '60
09 18 130

WORLD COMMUNISM IN REVIEW

HOOVER INSTITUTION ON WAR, REVOLUTION AND PEACE LIBRARY
STANFORD UNIVERSITY
NEW YORK CITY

by

HENRY R. HUTTENBACH

Gonzaga University

SPOKANE, WASHINGTON

PREFACE

BY

HIS EMINENCE, RICHARD CARDINAL CUSHING

ST. PAUL EDITIONS

[1960]

CONTENTS

Preface by His Eminence, Richard Cardinal Cushing 3

Introduction: Pearl Harbor Again. 5

PART I

The Communist State
The worker's paradise 8

1. *Universal Education:*
The Control of the Mind. 11

2. *Freedom of Religion:*
Constitutional Tyranny (1) 16

3. *The right to work:*
Constitutional Tyranny (2) 21

4. *Communist Dogma and Scientific Truth:*
The Defense of Error. 27

5. *Democratic Centralism:*
A Parliamentary Parody. 31

Resume. 35

PART II

The Communist Movement
The perpetual revolution 37

1. *Sovietization:* The New Colonialism 39

2. *Foreign Aid and Trade*
As Political Weapons. 44

3. *The Soviet Embassy:*
Headquarters for Espionage. 49

4. *The Art of Summitry:*
Global Deception. 53

Resume. 57

Conclusion: The Great Assignment. 59

Reading Guide 64

PREFACE

Communism has been waging a psychological war in the United States for the past thirty-five years. It is called a "Cold War". This is a new type of war with which Americans have not been familiar. But its results are terrifying. It enabled a tightly organized and disciplined group in Russia to conquer that vast country. When the Bolsheviks seized power, Russia was a nation of 180 million people. The capital at that time was Petrograd, now known as Leningrad. It was actually seized by surprise with a military organization of only thirty-six hundred commandos. True, the old Czarist empire had been decaying for years and that made such a conquest possible. But even so, the government had fifty thousand troops and twelve thousand police in the city when it was seized. Next came Moscow, followed by other areas until the original Bolsheviks have enlarged their gains by well-planned methods of organization and propaganda to what is now an empire of 800 million people or about one-third of the population of the world.

If you consider that a few years before the Russian revolution the entire Bolshevik Party had only about six thousand members and then contemplate the expansion of their empire in the short space of a little more than forty years, you will appreciate what they have been able to accomplish by subversion, organization, propaganda, agitation and deceit.

The central idea of "Cold Warfare" is to confuse or destroy the ideology of the "enemy". If they succeed in diverting or demoralizing our institutions and culture patterns, then a situation will be created where they can weaken us beyond our ability to survive.

To date, most Americans have not been sufficiently aroused by the success already attained and the possibilities of more success in the future through the "Cold War" techniques of the Communists. Admitting we have done everything in the way of accepting higher and higher taxes for military strength, that

we have made sacrifices unprecedented in history to help underprivileged nations and to win friends, we have not taken the time to study the nature and methods of the enemy. This, I believe, accounts for our apathy and indifference. It could be that the books on the subject have been too long and erudite for the average person. If that is the case, here is a booklet that everyone can understand. It presents some of the salient characteristics of this international conspiracy in simple, understandable language. I pray it will have a wide circulation.

The author asked me to sponsor the booklet. He expects no financial compensation. The Daughters of St. Paul, 50 St. Paul's Avenue, Jamaica Plain, Boston, Massachusetts, have answered my call for a publisher who will accept in return only the expenses involved. Hence the booklet will sell for 50¢ a copy, with a special discount for orders of fifty or more copies.

I recommend this work most enthusiastically to the upper classes of high schools, to all college students and to every organization interested in knowing the nature, the goal, the progress and the dangers of this international conspiracy bent on world-wide domination. Unless we have a knowledge of the enemy and unite to strengthen our defenses on every level, we cannot survive. Every liberty-loving person should know Communism and unite with others to stop its progress. Otherwise our freedom will be transformed into slavery. This booklet should be a challenge to all who read it.

+ Richard Card. Cushing

ARCHBISHOP OF BOSTON

INTRODUCTION: PEARL HARBOR AGAIN.

It is altogether possible that someday communism might engulf most of the globe. Historians of the future, looking back upon the advance of communism, might wonder why it was able to progress so rapidly. They might express surprise at the relatively weak opposition that had come from the western world and be astounded at the failure of the democracies to form a united front to resist their common enemy. And, they might wonder why the most powerful of the democracies, the United States, failed, or refused, to recognize the real dimensions of the communist danger.

There is little doubt that their answers will vary, and, if they are normal historians, they will disagree violently. Some might stress the lack of unity in the democratic alliance; others will point to the failure of the United Nations to become a supra-national authority; others will insist that the bloating standard of living rendered democratic citizens insensitive to a sense of danger. A few historians might suggest that, in the United States, the public's complacency and the government's lethargy were the primary causes. Due to a deep-seated fear, the nation tacitly agreed to preserve a suicidal illusion: the citizens supported those who boasted of the superior strength of the West, although all reports exposed its glaring weaknesses; they minimized the communist threat, although all reports attest to its ever-growing power; and, refusing to make the necessary sacrifices, they stubbornly created a false prosperity, which accelerated inflationary tendencies.

Perhaps one or two scholars might discover a strange phenomenon that seemed to point to the heart of the times: for some reason or other the general public had never been fully conscious of the actual meaning of communism. Despite daily reports in newspapers, on radios and television, despite voluminous articles in weekly magazines, the public had failed to become aware of the communist threat. As a nation America never arose to oppose communism. In 1941 when the shock of Pearl Harbor rallied every single citizen, it had met the challenge: no one questioned his duty, nor was he in doubt about

the proper course of action. But two decades later, America was plagued by doubts as to the character of its enemy and hesitated about its course of action. In fact, many in positions of authority even questioned whether one was not, after all, exaggerating the danger of communism. They spoke as if they were totally ignorant of its goals.

One future historian might notice that the United States did not lack experts on communism and Soviet affairs. On the shelves of most public libraries were excellent studies that more than adequately analyzed the true state of affairs. At the same time, the government had the best of advisors to help it draft an intelligent policy. And the major universities were staffed with hundreds of qualified teachers who could have prepared the younger generation to meet the communist challenge. Yet, somehow, despite this wealth of scholarly material, the bulk of the political leadership from the national down to the local level continued to hesitate, doubt, and failed to arrive at a clear policy with respect to communism. The image of the enemy never came into focus; he always seemed remote. Not until it was too late, did the public suddenly awaken to the horrible truth of communism. Not until the course of the future had been sealed did the individual suddenly and tragically discover what he should have done.

It is as an intermediary between the experts on Soviet Russia and the responsible reading public that I wish to write. Since the average community leader has no time to read the long and detailed studies made by our foremost scholars, it is hoped that he will find this little book sufficient to provoke discussion and encourage him to alert his community to the communist threat and insist upon determined political action. Parents, primary and secondary teachers, librarians, local editors, and the clergy all must join in a relentless effort to help the public realize that another Pearl Harbor has already arrived. Communism has attacked. All doubts about communism must be dispelled. The democratic public must see what communism is, what it seeks to do, and what it will mean to everyone. Unless all free citizens cooperate to strengthen the defenses of their free society, they will find themselves slaves.

If these pages succeed in stimulating a gnawing concern, then they will have been successful. For those who find them insufficient, an introductory bibliography has been appended. To those who find them inadequate, I apologize, hoping they will find another way to arm themselves against the common

enemy and will share my concern for the future of our children. May we never have to repeat Marshall Petain's epitaph after the fall of France in 1940: "Our spirit of enjoyment was greater than our spirit of sacrifice. We wanted to have more than we wanted to give. We spared effort, and we met disaster."

Finally, my deepest gratitude to those who helped me write these short essays: Professor D. W. Treadgold of the University of Washington, without whom I might never have been awakened to the communist threat; to Guy Smith of the Public Relations office of Gonzaga University who urged me to write this series of essays, imposing upon me a deadline, without which I would never have found time to write; and especially to His Eminence Richard Cardinal Cushing who was generous enough to express interest in these essays, write a preface, and provide a publisher. It is an honor to join such a distinguished crusader in the struggle against communism.

Part I

The Communist State

The worker's paradise

INTRODUCTION.

In his *Communist Manifesto,* Karl Marx looked forward to the day when the working classes of the world would be free from poverty and economic abuse. Such an ideal life he could only envision in a state wherein the political power lay in the hands of the workers themselves, for, as long as there were employers, there would always be "exploiters." Not until the workers became their own employers could they be sure of receiving all the benefits of their labor. Only if they controlled the means of production could they be certain of a life free from want and suppression. As long as economic power remained in the hands of a few, the workers would never share in the profit that was rightfully theirs.

In 1917, the communists finally came to power in Russia and had their first opportunity to build the worker's paradise that Karl Marx had dreamed of seventy years earlier. Following in the footsteps of Lenin and Stalin, Khrushchev is erecting what he claims to be a state whose primary concern is the welfare of its worker-citizens. For over forty years the communists have been transforming Russia into a communist state, and, today, little remains of the Tsarist Russia overthrown in 1917.

In its place stands the mightiest state in the world. What had been largely an agricultural society is now a highly industrialized nation. Within a few decades a new way of life has been established in the Soviet Union. Everything now is state-owned and state-planned. The state determines the course of each individual life from the moment of birth until death. Education, occupation, place of residence, salary, living conditions, entertainment, every facet of life is state-directed.

Visitors returning from Russia bring back all sorts of impressions. Agricultural experts report that Russia's farm-

ing methods are steadily improving, and yet we hear constantly of food shortages and crop failures. Engineers return with glowing reports of huge industrial projects and hydroelectric plants; but we are also told about a serious shortage of consumer goods and low standards of living. Educators have praised the high standards maintained in Russia's schools, but we also hear about censorship and falsification.

What has really happened in Russia? What accounts for the contradictory reports? What sort of a society has been imposed upon the Russian citizen? And what ideological basis motivates its rulers? Is it really a worker's paradise or do the people live in fear? In other words, what is life like for the average soviet citizen?

To answer this question, let us trace his life: let us watch his youth, his education, his career, and his political activities. Let us see whether Karl Marx's utopia has become an actuality or whether it remains a dream. Let us see whether the worker enjoys the benefits of 20th century society, and whether he is his own master. Let us see whether the communist government is the true representative of its citizens and whether it has managed to grant them the blessings of modern life and save them from suppression. Let us see then how perfect this "perfect society" really is.

And while we are tracing the progress made during the last forty-three years, let us not forget the methods used to erect this nation whose achievements so many admire. For while we are often blinded by the magnificence of man's accomplishments, we tend to forget the price in human suffering that now stands as dumb testimony to man's most ambitious plans.

Though the pyramids rank among Egypt's wonders, they are monuments to a despotic rule. They were built by slaves, each stone block costing many wretched lives. So as we turn to the communist successes, let us take care not to succumb to a tourist's naivete. As we see the splendor of industrial progress and feel the dynamic fervor of the communist state, let us remember to ask *why* all this activ-

ity is taking place and *how* progress is made. For no material improvement is worth sacrificing the liberty we enjoy in this country. No twist of logic can justify an act of tyranny. Much human energy has been expended in the name of a glorious future. Too much brutality has been justified and too many lives sacrificed for an impossible cause. Let us ask then, what is this worker's state, what has it cost so far, and can it succeed?

1. UNIVERSAL EDUCATION: THE CONTROL OF THE MIND.

In a totalitarian society there is little room for individual initiative, except for those who are in a position of authority; the primary function of every subordinate is unquestioning obedience. For a dictatorial state to function efficiently, it must demand absolute submission to authority. While any non-democratic government can resort to violence in order to enforce its wishes, it also relies heavily upon more subtle forms of persuasion. For, if it can so condition its masses to accept its policies without brutality (keeping it in the background as a constant threat), it will achieve an aura of compliance that easily deceives the foreign observer.

In order to achieve unanimity amongst its citizens, the Soviet government has had to condition its subjects. Like any dictatorship, it has had to regiment every individual in order to ensure a smooth-functioning society. While during the Stalin era it relied largely upon physical coercion, the visible forms of suppression, such as the secret police, have since been deemphasized and the stress is now on education. Since Khrushchev, reliance upon the persuasive powers of the classroom has steadily increased.

The reasons for this are two-fold. First, in order to afford less police activity, a substitute force had to be found; and education, it was hoped, would produce a docile population. Secondly, the huge economic and technological demands of our age call for thousands of skilled technologists and scientists. Russia, if she wishes to remain a world power, would have to continue her scientific progress. That is why, in recent years, more and more emphasis has been placed upon education in the U.S.S.R. Education spells national, and hence, political survival for the communists.

Consequently, education has had to concentrate upon two goals: indoctrination and training. First and foremost comes indoctrination. Starting with Kindergarten, where children are taught communist songs filled with anti-western slogans, the children are unremittingly exposed to Marxist-Leninism and Kremlin slogans. While still flexible and uncritical, the innocent minds of all young soviet citizens are taught an ideology that will prepare them to accept their environment and to shoulder their "social duty."

From the moment he enters the classroom, the student is given intense training in atheistic materialism. As Khrushchev said in 1954 "this is the integral part of communist education. . . . It has as its aim the dissemination of scientific materialistic knowledge to the masses." And again, in 1959, he said, "In the ideological field, the main task is to raise the consciousness of the working people, particularly of the new generation." They are to receive "education in the spirit of communist attitude towards work, in Soviet patriotism, and in internationalism" as well as be prepared "to overcome the remnants of capitalism . . . and struggle against bourgeois ideology." In other words the primary function of education is to turn out good communists who will obey their political leaders.

In order to increase the citizen's consciousness of his attitude towards life, Khrushchev passed a series of reforms in November 1958 which were designed to halt a dangerous development among students. Before completing their studies, they were to work in factories and spend some time in manual labor. While the obvious reason for the reforms might have been to release men to relieve the serious shortage of labor, the major reason was an increasing tendency on the part of the students to look down upon manual work and enjoy their life of relative ease.

Khrushchev immediately sensed the serious consequences if students were permitted to forget that their primary task was to tackle the practical problems of life. Speculation, discussions, any form of unsupervised "bull-sessions" could not be tolerated, for they would eventually

lead to criticism of the government. Students were supposed to be conditioned to Marxist-Leninism but never allowed to analyze it. Such curiosity might be catastrophic to the regime. Leisure time, lest it be devoted to idle thought, must be well-spent in the service of the state. Hence, the reform which forced thousands into the fields and workshops to engross them in the tasks that lay ahead, challenge their minds with practical problems, and teach them to obey the orders of their foremen. They were immersed in the building of the communist state and not left alone to wonder what it all was about.

But "loyal" subjects are not enough. More than faithful communists are needed to make communism succeed and turn Russia into the leading industrial nation. The age of automation, the space age, and the nuclear age can only be dealt with by an army of specialists. The tremendous pressures imposed by the 7-Year Plan call for amazing scientific advances in all fields. To train such men, the Soviet Union has established a network of technical schools, research academies and universities, whose high quality is confirmed by foreign visitors. By means of generous government grants and subsidies, education is made especially attractive.

But this picture has another side. Though a number of economic privileges and social opportunities are associated with education, making it an especially tempting bait, education is not unconditional. Entrance is strictly controlled by the government, and the candidates are chosen for their native talents as well as for their "reliability" i.e., their adherence to communism. Besides this hidden compulsion, there is another form of coercion that acts as a subtle force upon each student, namely, the government's power to withdraw its support should he either prove to be a poor student or show signs of "unorthodoxy" or "deviationism." Once financial aid is removed, the student is totally at the mercy of the state, subject to assignment to some menial task which is poorly paid and probably located in some far-off region. This threat accounts in part

for the violent spirit of competition among Russian students: it is more often a sign of survival instinct rather rather than an excess of patriotism.

In this way, "highly-skilled specialists brought up in the spirit of the Marxist-Leninist teachings" are graduated from Soviet schools. Their function in society is "to build communism" in the dual capacity of competent laborers and faithful communist citizens. In this way, they will be able "to perform socially useful labor . . . so that the state may correctly develop and make use of gifts existing amongst the people."

Thus, the schools simultaneously "disseminate scientific and political knowledge among the people." As is plainly written in Shore's *Soviet Education,*

> "The subject of pedagogy is the nurture of the young generation, i.e., the planned and purposeful preparation for future participation in social life. The nurture of the young generation is a social function at all stages of the youth's development. Just as labor, in Marx's terms, is the natural condition of human life . . . education, according to Lenin, is the best insurance for future communism."

Consequently, education is merely an extension of the government. The government provides the funds, controls the teachers, determines the curriculum, sets the standards, and selects the students. Since outside the state school system there exist no other recognized institutions, the government enjoys a monopoly, with which it can blackmail the student population. By legislating universal education, it ensures itself a growing number of "safe" citizens upon whom it entrusts the building of the communist state. None can escape this brain-washing, and, to the unspecting majority, it has given them a modus vivendi.

The perverted intentions of Soviet education are perhaps best summarized in the following description of its goals. Each citizen is to be instilled with:

> "Soviet patriotism; bolshevist vigilance; socialist attitude toward public and personal property;

realism to withstand the alien ideology inherited from the psychology of private property ownership and petty bourgeois moods; socialist humanism; collectivism and comradeship; communist attitude toward labor and social responsibilities; conscious discipline; honesty and truthfulness; strong will; courage and persistence; cultural behavior, cleanliness, courtesy, compliance and tactfulness. However, in order to avoid an artificial split of the united educational process, the educator must integrate their interrelationships with a communist moral unity. A thoughtful, persistent education on these lines will produce, according to Soviet educators, the new men of the classless society."

This, then, is the tragedy of communist education. Beginning with the primary grades, the State invades the minds of its youngest citizens, turning them into efficient servants. Instead of using education as a liberating agent, it deliberately utilizes it to enslave the mind. Under communism, literacy has become a means of disseminating an evil ideology which warps even the strongest of minds. Thus, the dreaded secret police has actually been replaced by a much more insiduous institution whose persuasive powers are much more effective.

2. FREEDOM OF RELIGION:

CONSTITUTIONAL TYRANNY (1).

Although communism is the avowed enemy of religion, millions of Russians still practice their respective faith. Within the borders of the Soviet Union, there are large groups of Orthodox Christians and Moslems, as well as Roman Catholics, Baptists, and Jews. These are citizens of a regime that practices the most extreme form of militant atheism known to man. The communists see in religion the very antithesis of their beliefs: while they are confirmed materialists, religion looks to a reality above and beyond matter, and whereas they believe communism holds the key to man's happiness, religion deals with a life after death in which man can find happiness far exceeding any earthly joy. Such opposing positions cannot exist side by side. They are irreconcilable.

And yet, despite this uncompromising situation, provision has been made in the Soviet Constitution to permit religious worship. Article 124 reads as follows: "In order to ensure to citizens freedom of conscience, the church in the U.S.S.R. is separated from the state, and the school from the church." This grants the churches the right to exist and flourish without state support as in the United States. But the concluding sentence of the article leaves no doubt why religion has been allowed to continue in a state that has declared it an enemy. "Freedom of religious worship and freedom of anti-religious propaganda is recognized for all citizens." This paradox can only be interpreted as an open declaration of war, a legalization of attacks upon an institution which is nevertheless constitutionally recognized. By granting to religion a pseudo-freedom, the State has transformed itself into an arena wherein a mortal combat takes place. Having made the

provision that only one of the combatants may attack the other, the state has assured itself of the total disarmament of its opponent. Only anti-religious forces may strike; the churches must remain passive. Action on their part, even in self-defense, would immediately be considered treason.

Religion may be practiced, but at the same time it has to endure persecution sanctioned by the very state that grants it the right to exist! To all appearances, churches and mosques operate normally, celebrate their respective festivals, and are well attended. But, beneath this scene of calm religious life, a violent struggle is taking place that deeply affects every brave soul who dares show his courage by acknowledging his affiliation with any religion. By participating in religious services he is publicly demonstrating his scorn for the communist regime and exposing himself to its attacks.

While all Orthodox church publications are either forbidden or are under strict communist supervision; and while their economic strength has been wiped out by confiscation and taxation; and while their social utility has been rendered nil by the total secularization of life in which the state has assumed all its former functions (such as birth registration, marriage, divorce, and burial); anti-religious activity, making use of all means at hand, has relentlessly attacked the clergy and congregations. Supported by state funds and condoned by the constitution, the forces of atheism are faced with relatively little opposition except what human courage the faithful can muster.

The instruments of anti-religious activity can be divided into four major categories:

1. Public media of communication: the press, radio, television, the movies and the theater. All are employed to carry the message of atheism. Each, in its way, condemns, accuses, and ridicules religion by distorting the truth in order to alienate the public from religion.
2. Public lectures: professional speakers have been trained to lecture in particularly strong religious centers in order to create doubts, encourage disputes, and create disturbances that will interfere with normal religious

functions. By arranging to speak on religious days and making attendance obligatory, they frighten the weaker individuals away from the church. These agents are skilled orators and some have been quite effective, although many have been criticized for dull lectures.

3. The schools: since religion is not a part of the curriculum, and religious instruction is rigorously discouraged outside of school, the child is reared in an atmosphere totally divorced from religion. Everything is done to hinder his coming into contact with religious ideas. State-organized activities fill his free time, particularly on religious holidays. In school he is constantly exposed to anti-religious propaganda, so that eventually, he can join the ranks of the "militant atheists."
4. *Coercion*: A man who is affiliated with any religious organization immediately finds himself denied numerous privileges. Obviously he cannot become a member of the Communist Party and enjoy the prestige associated with it. His chances of receiving a higher education are slim. Consequently, he forces himself and his family to suffer a precarious marginal existence. He not only brings much abuse upon himself, but his relatives automatically become suspect and are prevailed upon in the hope they will persuade him from continuing his religious practices. Many have weakened in the face of this psychological pressure, a form of blackmail typical of totalitarian regimes.

Of course, not all the churches are attacked at once. At present the communists have allied themselves with the Orthodox Christians and made them a show-piece for propaganda purposes. Four seminaries are still open and several hundred churches remain to serve the religious needs of an estimated 35-45 million Orthodox Christians, but the organization is riddled with communist agents. Even candidates to the priesthood are often communist spies. And, judging from the official church publications, the press is under communist control, and, like the rest of the church, it is totally dependent upon the state.

For the time being, the communists see fit to maintain this alliance of convenience. While perpetuating the Orthodox Church a few more years, they not only live up to the letter of the constitution, but the temporary truce serves several communist ends. Firstly, the voice of the church can call to other Orthodox Christians outside the Communist bloc and act as an extension of the Soviet government. Secondly, the continued semi-peaceful existence of the Church is a useful propaganda tool for placating world opinion. Thirdly, it gives the communists a strategic victory by severing the Orthodox Church from other religious organizations, preventing them from forming a formidable nucleus of opposition to the regime. And finally, since millions of Orthodox Christians live in the Ukraine, (long a center of resistance both against communism and Moscow domination,) the communists probably hope to quiet any demonstrations against the government by this policy of appeasement. This policy is particularly feasible for Khrushchev, who must find a way to live down the name "Hangman of the Ukraine."

Behind this screen of tolerance, a vicious campaign against the Jews demonstrates the continuing policy of the communists to exterminate every vestige of religious life. Recent years have seen concerted moves to put an end to Jewish cultural life. Only one synagogue remains open in Moscow, while the remaining 3,000,000 Jews in Russia must lead a clandestine religious life. Since the founding of Israel, the Jews have been branded "agents of western imperialism," and any desire to emigrate to that country is immediately associated with a desire to assist "a capitalistic outpost." And so, even this door of escape has been closed to the Jews. They are at the complete mercy of a government which has purged them from the party and excluded them from the benefits of education. While berating West Germany for the recent outbreaks of anti-semitism, the Soviet Union itself is practicing a policy reminiscent of Adolf Hitler.

Only when one can measure communism in human suffering does he suddenly become aware of its ruthless-

ness. In its anti-religious policy one catches a shocking glimpse of communism in action. Too often does this aspect remain hidden in constitutional clauses, such as article 124. The tendency is to point to communism's contradictory nature, never fully realizing the daily manifestations of these contradictions as they destroy, little by little, all forms of religious activity.

Its religious policy, in particular, reveals the true face of communism, for in religion, communists see a triple threat. First, religion encourages a form of individuality that no communist can tolerate—by placing the individual above the state. Secondly, any metaphysical idea is repulsive to a dialectical materialist. Thirdly, communism, which seeks the undivided loyalty of its citizens, cannot tolerate organizations that demand allegiance to themselves. These ideas are incompatible with orthodox Marxism. Therefore it is to be expected that communists will continue their religious persecution. It is all part of an epic struggle for existence: in fighting religion, communism is fighting for its life.

The forty-year survival of religious life in the Soviet Union, despite the brutal methods of the Stalin era, stands as testimony to the indomitable spirit of man that follows its conscience, even in the face of death. To this day, the religious fervor of millions of Soviet citizens haunts the communist authorities. Although the newspapers have launched a new anti-religious campaign, religious activity remains one of the most successful ways of defying the communist movement. In many areas, such as Poland and East Germany, it is the only effective way of countering communist suppression.

Thus, the churches were not given freedom. Instead, a constitutional maneuver imprisoned them in a state that provided for their extermination. What they had actually received was a slow death sentence, having been rendered a helpless prey to communism. This is perhaps one of the most diabolical perversions of constitutionality, in which legal sanction is bestowed upon the murderer but not upon his victim.

3. THE RIGHT TO WORK:

CONSTITUTIONAL TYRANNY (2).

A right is not an obligation. It is essentially a freedom guaranteed by the state; however, the individual citizen is under no compulsion to exercise it. Freedom means the right to do or not to do. Without this choice there can be no right. It is the essence of freedom as understood in the West, and it distinguishes right from duty and obligation which are positive demands for action.

Nevertheless, the negative factor is conspicuously absent in the communist "right to work" clause, article 118 of the Soviet Constitution.

> "Citizens of the U.S.S.R. have the right to work, that is the right to guaranteed employment and payment for their work in accordance with quantity and quality. The right to work is ensured by the socialist organization of the national economy, the steady growth of the productive forces of Soviet society, the elimination of the possibility of economic crises and the abolition of unemployment."

But is such guaranteed work a right? That a communist state should show concern for its workers seems only natural. Since it seeks to end all economic abuses, its effort to combat unemployment and all its evil consequences is reasonable enough. But, why have the communists not made room for the essential right "not to work"? In order to answer this question, let us quickly trace the history of the trade unions in the Soviet Union.

In 1917, shortly before the Russian Revolution, the major centers of communist support were the industrial areas. Each factory had a communist organization which instigated strikes and organized demonstrations serving both the workers' and the party's political interests. Many

of the party's major spokesmen came from the workers' ranks, and the November revolution is partly the result of the cooperation between the communist political leadership and the trade unions. One provided the leadership and the other military strength. But the party leadership often found itself having to bow to the will of union representatives. The communists' continued success depended largely upon the cooperation of the workers. Consequently, during the early days of the regime, there existed this crucial interdependence, which made Lenin, Trotsky, and later Stalin acutely aware of the threat posed by the strong labor organizations. Unless the unions were brought under control, the communist government could not be free to act independently.

Once the communist position had been fairly well consolidated, the unions were slowly transformed into government weapons. They retained their power to strike with the provision that it be used only against private enterprises. Led by Tomsky, the head of the Council of Trade Unions, the union leaders encouraged strikes against "the capitalists." All other labor movements were carefully controlled, and striking against nationalized concerns was criticized as "counter-revolutionary." In 1901, Lenin had already condemned the strike as ideologically untenable, as an expression of "individualism" which challenges the power of the state. Not only does the right to strike resemble treason, but it is, logically speaking, an absurdity. To strike would obstruct the "government of the worker." In this sense, the worker would be struggling against himself. So, by 1928 the right to strike was prohibited since all privately-owned industry had been nationalized.

As Stalin rose in power, he removed all those who stood in his way, and among those purged were the "unionists" who sought to retain the power of the unions. By 1938, the end of the great purge, the unions were manned by party agents. The union leaders, communist lieutenants, saw to it that quotas were met and watched for any signs of disloyalty. From then on, the unions acted as government organs, passing orders down to the workers. Finally, to

complement the 1936 constitutional provision, a law passed in 1940 declared labor to be "an obligation." And so, twenty years after the communist rise to power, the worker found himself deprived of any means of collective bargaining, under constant government supervision, and with no right to refuse employment. A right had become a duty.

But, even if labor were not compulsory, the relationship between the Soviet worker and his employer, that is his government, is far from democratic. To begin with, the worker finds himself totally dependent upon the government for any form of employment since the government owns all industry. As a result, food and shelter become state controlled, so that the worker must look to the government for his source of income. Enjoying such a monopoly, the Soviet government is in a position to make demands upon the individual. On its own terms, it can order him to work, assigning him where it pleases. To refuse to work for the government, aside from being a criminal act, would leave the individual with no source of income, unless he turned to crime.

The labor unions play their role as extensions of the government in "encouraging" each to do his utmost. Like army units, the trade unions receive orders from above. Since Russia's economy is state-planned, orders have to be carried out effectively, and the unions take the place of government foremen, reporting absenteeism and tardiness, recommending promotions and disciplinary measures. As Lenin said in 1921, unions are "the reservoir of state power." By 1941, this became a reality, when a Stalin spokesman pointed out that "trade unions carry out the directives of the party." And, only recently, on November 14, 1958, Khrushchev, as he outlined the thesis of the 7-Year Plan, emphatically stated that the unions are a means "to enroll the masses for the management of the economy." Accordingly, the unions are not set up to provide the worker with an instrument of collective bargaining to deal with matters of wages, hours, and working conditions. Instead, they are there to prevent his organizing and facilitate the regimentation of labor by the government.

Thus, the Soviet Union has been able to call upon armies of laborers ready to carry out the dictates of the Central Economic Planning Committee. Over the years, it has transformed relatively powerful trade unions into organs of the state, rendering them subservient to itself. Whereas one might expect the unions to run the government, since they represent the workers, the situation was reversed by Stalin. The Russian worker now finds himself under a far worse employer than Marx could ever have imagined. The industrial worker is a helpless tool of government planning.

Trapped in the unions, the worker must fulfil unreasonable quotas. Watched by union overseers who observe his "loyalty," he is in constant fear of pay and ration cuts should his work not be "in accordance with quantity and quality" as defined by his government. Failure on his part might be interpreted as "indolence" which carries with it the threat of dismissal, which the unions use as effective blackmail. As Khrushchev put it so crudely in 1958, "Trade organizations must direct public wrath against perpetrators of waste, idlers, and shirkers." The unions must urge the workers to work at full capacity without due compensation. Their goal is increased production and not the workers' welfare.

As such, the Soviet trade unions resemble their western counterparts in name only. Hidden behind their innocuous title, there operates a tyrannical machinery with enormous power that isolates one worker from the other and prevents him from establishing any collective force. Far from promoting conditions designed to protect the worker from exploitation, the unions abuse him far more than do the "capitalistic exploiters." Having reduced the worker to utter helplessness, they make him live in constant fear. Not only can the government punish him with economic retaliation, that is, wage reduction or even unemployment; but it can threaten him with slave labor in some far off region. The constant fear of forced resettlement hovers over every worker, especially family members, who can be terrorized by the thought of separation. As part of the Soviet program

of industrial expansion, hundreds of thousands have already been resettled in the depths of Siberia, but at the expense of unbelievable human suffering. Overnight, whole cities were erected of worker-populations literally drafted, irrespective of family ties, age, or health. While many were chosen for their special talents, not a few were selected because of their "unhealthy political tendencies." Thus, in a state where work is supposed to be an honorable task, it has been reduced to a punishment.

While the workers of the industrial West are enjoying an unparalleled standard of living, wielding sufficient political power to bargain for any necessary improvement, their Russian counterparts can point to neither economic well-being nor any political power. Year after year, they are asked to wait for a golden future and make further sacrifices; but year after year fulfilment seems further away. The housing shortage steadily becomes more acute. Wages are low while prices continue to rise. Though Khrushchev boasts a 36-hour week, he fails to add that no one can earn enough in that period and must, therefore, seek supplementary work.

But even though the standard of living will probably rise, this is no guarantee that the reins of trade-union dictatorship will be slackened. More than likely, the chance of obtaining certain luxuries will be used as further coercion. A higher standard of living will become the prize of those who fulfil their quota and demonstrate their "loyalty" by working "unselfishly" for the state. There is little hope that the trade unions will disappear, for they are the necessary weapons of a state that relies solely on its absolute power to dominate the individual.

In the Soviet Union, the Communist Party has asserted itself upon the worker, the very man who helped put it into power. Perhaps the Soviet Union's treatment of its workers is its greatest betrayal. Motivated primarily by fear, they find themselves less and less in the worker's paradise predicted by Marx, and more in a worker's hell where they have no means of self-protection. The state, that was to have procured for them a life safe from economic oppres-

sion, has turned out to be the source of unequalled political and economic exploitation. The unions, which ought to protect them from any abuse, have become the affiliates of the state, symbols of tyranny. The "blessing" of guaranteed employment carries with it nothing but insecurity and repression.

4. COMMUNIST DOGMA AND SCIENTIFIC TRUTH: THE DEFENSE OF ERROR.

While the laborer and the skilled worker can find relative security in total submission, the scientist finds himself in a much more hazardous position. Having to deal with the mysteries of the physical world, he is continually forced to theorize in order to unearth its secrets. As a result, he places himself in a precarious siuation, because he might formulate a concept of the material world that does not quite coincide with the official Marxist interpretation.

Should such a situation arise in the Soviet Union, what happens? When the party finds itself in conflict with its scientists, who must bow? Does the Communist Party, in the interest of scientific progress, retreat ideologically and admit its tenets to be wrong? Or are the scientists forced to remain in harmony with the official party line? Are the men of the Kremlin prepared to modify their position and admit certain revisions for the sake of technological advancement if there is any chance of endangering the fundamental premises of communism?

While the communist leaders have admitted tactical mistakes, they have never denied the infallibility of the basic communist assumptions. One of these "objective, scientific truths" declares that all life is conditioned by its physical environment and can be essentially altered if its material surroundings are equally radically changed. Living organisms, they claim, can adjust so much that they will lose some permanent characteristics and acquire others, even to the extent of changing their species. Consequently, man, whose cultural climate is determined by his economic environment, could build a new civilization if he were to find himself in a new economic system.

It is this hypothesis that is used to justify the communist political program which seeks to rebuild society. Con-

sequently, to challenge it is to question every institution in the Soviet Union, from the party to the collective farm. Not only must it be protected from "conjecturism," but its validity has to have living proof. Because if communism is not demonstrable, every communist leader will find himself without any ideological support.

The fate of genetics in the Soviet Union illustrates most tragically what happens when science collides with communist dogma. During the 1920's, Soviet geneticists generally followed the theories prevalent in the West. But, as Stalin consolidated his totalitarian rule, everyone, even the scientists, were forced to conform to communist doctrine. With the help of a pseudo-scientist, Lysenko, the ranks of the Soviet geneticists were thoroughly purged. Anyone who continued to uphold the theory that heredity was primarily accountable for the characteristics of living things was publicly condemned and forbidden to practice. All those who insisted that genes were essentially free from environmental influences were ruthlessly purged. Only those who accepted the orthodox Marxist interpretation and renounced the "bourgeois" theory were reinstated.

Lysenko and his assistants, who were Party agents, produced supporting data and publicized fantastic claims to prove "that the nature of things can be changed by their environment." Every experiment and "discovery" was amply rewarded with official praise, prizes, and promotions.

Numerous attempts by leading scientists in the rest of the world to corroborate communist data ended in failure. None could find any evidence to substantiate the claims of their Soviet colleagues. What had seemed a common disagreement among scientists was slowly uncovered as blatant interference by political authorities in the field of science, a deliberate thwarting of free inquiry in order to prevent further investigation of a theory that has serious political implications. The struggle, which had taken place under the guise of a normal polemics in scholarly journals and heated debates at scientific conferences, turned out to be a desperate obstruction of science by the Kremlin in order to frustrate a highly dangerous development. Since

Stalin had just completed his nationalization program and was enforcing universal collectivization of the peasants, he could not afford to have Marxist dogma challenged at this crucial moment. Although genetics might seem remotely related to political ideology, in this case, it was at the center of the arena.

Once the Lysenko proponents had triumphed, a large-scale program of re-education had to be inaugurated. Text books had to be rewritten and new professors trained; convincing experiments had to be devised to support Lysenko's theories and strong arguments found to attack the old theory. Throughout the 1940's, a new generation of geneticists was trained and a totally revised scientific literature was placed on the shelves. The young scientists were introduced to a false theory, and the evidence in non-communist sources was withheld from them. As a result, they are politically indoctrinated scientists, kept from free experimental inquiry.

Were this the full extent of the story, the Lysenko incident might have gone by unnoticed. Unfortunately it has had tragic consequences that once again demonstrate the viciousness of communism. The truth had to be hidden at all costs. Because of the communists' stubborn refusal to accept scientific evidence, all fields dependent upon genetic theories have suffered intensely. Perennial crop failures, a constant headache for the communists, are partly due to Lysenkoism. Apart from chronic mechanical failure of outmoded farm equipment, (which has hindered every harvest,) and discounting loss from draught, crops have failed because they were sown in unsuitable climates and soils.

It has been a well-known ambition of the communists to cultivate the colder regions of Siberia. Year after year, at tremendous costs, they have planted grain and seedlings with disappointing results. The grain failed to adapt itself to its environment and the trees did not grow according to plan. Despite this overwhelming evidence against Lysenko's theory, more and more acres are cultivated. Pathetic photographs of orchards in southern desert regions show the trees bent to grow along the ground. But still the return is

poor. The trees are not meant to grow in such extreme heat, and no amount of communist dogma will make them grow. Nature cannot be bullied by man.

This might not be so serious were it not for the fact that the Russian population must suffer on account of the Lysenko program. As the population grows, its grain production must increase correspondingly. So far it has not, partly because of the tremendous waste in funds and labor spent proving the fundamental Marxist tenet that things will adapt themselves to their environment. Despite warnings from statisticians that production must increase, the Kremlin continues to enforce Lysenko's theory, for it cannot afford to have its ideological infallibility questioned.

To save face, the Kremlin has blamed administrators for the failure of its agricultural program. The recent purging of Belyaev and Kirichenko has been ascribed to an attempt by Khrushchev to push responsibility for recent failures upon his assistants, although he himself has been one of the loudest exponents of the Lysenko theory. In fact, when Khrushchev came to power, Lysenko, who had been temporarily in disgrace after the death of Stalin, found favor in official circles again. All the articles that had appeared in the *Botanical Journal* criticizing Lysenko were condemned, and the Lysenko movement was revived.

How long the Kremlin can afford this campaign to protect itself is disputable. In the past, famines have not deterred the communists. So far, the grain supplies have been supplemented by imports from the Satellites who, as a result, have had to suffer serious shortages. How long the Russian people can be made the victims of this defense of error is a matter of speculation. What is, however, tragically evident is the deliberate distortion of truth at the expense of mankind. This is the most hideous side of totalitarianism. Not only have the minds of brilliant men been skillfully controlled, but humanity has been made to suffer so that a few men can remain in power.

5. DEMOCRATIC CENTRALISM:

A PARLIAMENTARY PARODY.

To the uninitiated observer, the manner in which the Soviet Union is ruled might appear to be perfectly acceptable. There is a constitution which guarantees individual rights and defines the powers of each branch of government; there is the Supreme Soviet consisting of two houses (the Soviet of the Union and the Soviet of the Nationalities, which approximate the House of Representatives and the Senate); and there are regular elections. However, although the framework for democratic action exists, and the elected members go through the motions of parliamentary procedure, the manner in which laws are made in no way resembles that of the West. A more careful examination of the democratic superstructure will expose a totally different form of government.

Every four years, national elections are held. The occasion is marked by a holiday and a hundred percent turnout at the polls. The candidate who appears on the ballot sheet need not be elected, room having been made for write-in candidates should the voter not approve of the one selected by the official organizations that have the right to nominate candidates. So there is a choice. But so far, very few seem to have made use of this privilege, since Soviet election results invariably report over 99% popular approval. The reason for this becomes immediately evident when it is known that those who wish to vote for someone else must do so in full view of everyone else, thereby exposing themselves to possible recrimination. They may vote in a special room reserved for those who wish to vote secretly. But in either case they make themselves conspicuous and are, therefore, easily discouraged.

The names to be voted on are selected by constitutionally approved groups as outlined in Article 141 of the Soviet Constitution. "The right to nominate candidates is secured by public organizations and societies of the working people: Communist Party organizations, trade unions, cooperatives, youth organizations, and cultural societies."

But, according to its leading political scientists "The Party realizes . . . the state leadership of the society . . . with the assistance of the Trade Unions, the cooperatives, the Communist Youth League, and other Social organizations." In other words, only Party-controlled agencies may make nominations, which means that all nominees are Party-approved and represent one party only. Once nominated, all candidates are again screened by the Party itself for their "suitability," and only then can they appear on the ballot. Refusal to accept a candidate needs no explanation. Hence, everyone finally elected is representative of the party, and in no way reflects the wishes of the electorate.

Until the time of election, the candidates, who are always unopposed, participate in an ardent "campaign." During that time, issues are not debated, but recent and future government policies are publicized. It is an opportunity for the government to rally the population, the campaign being no more than a propaganda stunt. As a result, when election returns are in, the communists invariably point to the overwhelming majority they received as a vote of confidence.

Once elected, the deputies are required to convene twice a year, but more often than not they are summoned only once. These gatherings last a few days, during which committees are organized, chairmen elected, and government spokesmen heard. Nothing is ever legislated; instead, unanimous approval is thunderously extended to proposals read by committee members. Serious debate never ensues. The only discussion allowed is in the form of criticism and praise: up-and-coming party men direct attacks against men who have fallen out of favor and are about to be purged because of an inner political rivalry; or, they deliver tedious and extended eulogies that sing the praises of the government. Then the session ends. It seems peculiar that even the most faithful are not permitted to deliberate.

The obvious conclusion is that the Supreme Soviet acts as a mere rubber stamp. But that would be too simple an answer. Though it lacks legislative power, it does have a function. Besides serving as a public demonstration of communist purported democracy, its members have a specific

task which Khrushchev made quite clear. Speaking to the assembled houses in 1956, he said "the government of the Soviet Union has successfully executed its duties relating to the administration of the State." Its role is to see that the policies it has approved will be expedited in their respective regions. Having been instructed at the regular sessions what new policies would go into effect, its assignment now was to help promote the communist program.

Then where does the real power in the Soviet Union lie? From the control exerted by the Communist Party during elections, it is safe to assume that it is within the Party. But, judging by the agenda of the yearly sessions, it is obvious that it is not the rank and file that is given any voice in policy-making. Only a closer look at party organization will show us who makes decisions and how they are made.

No communist will deny the absolute power of the Party. "The Party leadership consists first of all in this, that the Party determines the political line, the policy that forms the foundation of the action of the whole mechanism of the socialist state." And again: "All important political organizational questions are decided by the State and social organizations in accordance with the directives given by the Party." "The Party directives form the nucleus of law, as the Party forms the nucleus of the government." So, we realize that behind the visible government is another organization that has a tight grip on the Soviets.

While the government goes through the motions of legislation, the Communist Party operates according to another set of rules. Though it arrives at decisions via the principle of "democratic centralism", it has nothing to do with conventional democratic procedure. This principle, as formulated by Lenin, requires that the Party select its own membership, that strict military discipline be observed, and that the minority abide by the decisions of the majority. Theoretically, the Party leadership is chosen by its members, but in actuality, one reaches the top by a complex path of intrigue and group influence that the outer-world never sees in detail.

The Central Committee forms the outer circle of the Party, consisting of about one hundred of the most influ-

ential communists in the Soviet Union. In it cliques are formed supporting various members of the inner circle, the Presidium. Comprising twenty-five senior members, who are able to muster enough support to safeguard their membership in the Presidium, this nucleus represents the power group in the Soviet Union. By controlling the membership of the Central Committee, they insure their position and secure approval of their policies.

Operating according to the Charter of the Party, they call for absolute obedience, every member having to accept the orders of the Presidium. As defined in Article 21, this calls for the "unconditionally obligatory force of the decisions of the higher organs for the lower ones." Though this seems to contradict Lenin's provision that the minority bow to the majority, such is not the case. Since the Presidium is chosen by the majority of the Central Committee, it can claim that all its decisions reflect the will of the majority. Consequently, the Central Committee often finds itself forced to accept measures decided upon by the Presidium, which do not meet with its approval. Party doctrine requires total submission to this body.

Total subordination must prevail to keep the Communist Party in power. As Lenin pointed out: "The Communist Party can only perform its duty effectively if it is organized in the most centralized manner, only if iron discipline bordering on military discipline prevails, and if its Party center is a powerful organ of authority." In such a philosophy there is no room for democratic action. It negates discussion and rejects legitimate opposition. While some form of debate is tolerated beforehand, once the decision has been made no criticism is allowed. Then the principle of "centralism" goes into effect, "the strict subordination of the lower organization to the higher." This is the central thought of the world's most perfect dictatorship.

And so, while several hundred deputies gather together to perform a yearly ritual devoid of real political power, a few men in the Kremlin draft the fate of millions. What the world observes is a tragic abuse of democratic machinery, a constant reminder that while this farcical game is played, democracy is being mocked publicly.

RESUME.

A perfect society is one in which the individual can live free from fear. He enjoys this freedom only in a state that recognizes and safeguards the primacy of the individual, granting him the security of institutional protection. The police, the courts, the military, and the laws of the land must guarantee him a life relatively free from assault by other individuals and groups. To the extent that a state fulfils this obligation it becomes a haven for the individual.

From what we have seen of the Soviet Union, the individual comes second. The primacy of the State is the dominant theme throughout communist Russia. In order to enforce this doctrine, the State towers over the individual and is in a position to dictate his life through various institutional pressures. The schools, the unions, the police, all serve to enforce the will of the State upon the individual who has no means of protection against the State. Perpetual coercion places the individual in a social environment in which he can find no privacy or freedom.

Life in the Soviet Union lacks the security an individual can find in a free society. Those institutions which normally provide the individual with some measure of protection, such as the family, the Church, or the trade unions, these either do not exist or have been so modified that they do not function democratically. Throughout his life, the individual is deprived of those social institutions which act as buffers against any possible attacks. The family, which should protect the child, is kept apart: the parents work and the children are placed in state nurseries. Consequently, Soviet citizens grow up without experiencing the protection of the family circle. The church no longer provides a common avenue of escape from the impersonality of society. Trade unions no longer offer the worker protection. Those agencies expected to side with the individual, the police and the courts, have become arbitrary instruments of the state and cannot be looked to for help. The individual in communist Russia stands alone.

As a result of this insecurity, every Soviet citizen is haunted by fear. He is never alone: the State is ever pres-

ent. The visible State teaches, entertains, employs; it rewards and punishes; it determines careers, decides promotions, and designates residence. The invisible State watches: everyone is quietly aware of the ubiquitous spies. No one can be trusted; even the observer is observed. The totalitarianism imposed upon the individual has succeeded in isolating him. Not a single natural group is free from state supervision. Thus, Russian society has been atomized, every individual so separated from the other that the only uniting force left is a subtle coercive element operating on every level, and rendering the individual powerless. Thus the communist state emerges as the very antithesis of free society.

No one can deny the vast changes that have taken place since 1917; but the virtue of any change is determined by the life of the individual. Deserts have been tamed, rivers rerouted, mineral resources tapped. At first one cannot help but admire the dynamism that moves a society to such brilliant successes. Despite overwhelming losses in World War II, the Soviet Union has emerged as a world power—but at what price? Cities have risen overnight and industrial production increases yearly—but to whose benefit? Such phenomena can be deceiving, and, rather than signs of progress, are often evidence of retrogression. We must ask the individual whether life in the new cities is a free life, whether the products of the factories fill his home; we must listen to university lectures and read the textbooks; we must visit the anti-religious museums housed in Churches; we must attend a union meeting.

As we consider this thriving land, we must never forget the fifteen million peasants slaughtered during the era of collectivization nor the thousands who died as they were transplanted to distant parts of Russia to industrialize the trans-Ural region. We must remember the hundreds of thousands who fill the slave labor camps, convicted of being "enemies of the people," "revisionists," "bourgeois reactionaries," "capitalist agents," etc. Only then will the horror behind the much-advertised "progress" move us to revulsion. Communism has turned Russia into a prison from which death seems the only escape.

Part II

The Communist Movement

The perpetual revolution

INTRODUCTION.

Having seen communism's effect on the Soviet Union, we are ready to ask a second question: what does communism mean for the rest of the world? Since 1945, communism has become a world movement. Although in theory it has always been international in scope, until the end of World War II it was confined to Eurasia, primarily Russia. Since then, it has spread over every continent, becoming highly influential. With the emergence of the Soviet Union as a world power, communism has changed from a mere political experiment to an economic, social, and military force. There is not a single nation that does not have a legal or underground communist organization, and is not in some way in contact with a communist nation.

There are four major spheres of communist activity. The first is the satellite zone, which is under total communist control. The second is the neutral zone, whose nations have accepted Soviet aid, and trade with the Communist bloc. The third is the Western sphere, whose nations primarily confine their contact with the Soviet Union to diplomatic channels. The fourth sphere consists of the great powers, who deal on the "summit" level. For each group, the Soviet Union has carefully devised a program which conceals its true motive.

Nothing is more baffling than communist tactics. Communism is so ubiquitous and assumes so many forms that it seems to defy understanding. The versatility of Party agents makes their actions appear contradictory. Communists sometimes side with labor, sometimes with management; their goal is agitation. They can be found in the ranks of both segregationists and integrationists. They condemn parliamentarianism, yet they sponsor legal communist Parties to participate in democratic governments. They fight religion; yet they lose no opportunity to damn those

who show signs of intolerance. In one instance they will support revolutionary movements, in another they back the existing government. While establishing diplomatic relations, they also organize underground movements. They are as likely to ally with Nazi regimes as with democratic ones. To the uninitiated observer this resembles sheer opportunism, lacking ideological motivation. But a careful analysis will uncover a recurring pattern and a definite goal: world domination.

1. SOVIETIZATION: THE NEW COLONIALISM.

With the coming to power of communist regimes in Eastern Europe, a new era began. The communist seizure of power meant more than a change of government. It spelled the beginning of Moscow's domination through representatives in the respective capitals. The policies inaugurated once the communists gained control soon showed that this was no ordinary change of government. Instead of independent national policies, Eastern Europe reflected a Moscow-directed plan. In the years following 1948, the face of each country changed radically, and Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Poland, and Rumania experienced revolutionary reforms that sought to transform them into communist societies similar to the U.S.S.R. Though originally East Germany was not one of the satellite countries, it has since become an integral part of the Soviet bloc, and a study of its post-war years will illustrate what happens when the communists take over.

Although the occupation of Germany was to be a temporary measure until the signing of a peace treaty, the Russians never intended to vacate their sector. As tension between the allies mounted, it became obvious what each occupying force wanted. While England, France, and the United States integrated their zones in hopes of rebuilding a unified Germany, the Russian authorities made less and less effort to cooperate, slowly severing relations with the allies. As the Western powers withdrew and established an independent West Germany, the Soviet Union introduced a policy aimed at erecting a communist society in East Germany. The 1945 occupation of East Germany was not long a normal military occupation. Within a few weeks there emerged a regime whose interests were not solely military. The communist conquerors began to preach new values and institute a new social order. This metamorphoses is known as Sovietization, the imposing of communism.

This process is realized in two steps:

1. The organization of human relations in such a way as to make opposition impossible and impose social institutions resembling their Russian prototype.
2. The channeling of social energies according to the principles of historical and dialectical materialism, thereby creating a new society: a Soviet society.

In other words, the concept of Sovietization means superimposing, by coercion or persuasion, the same blueprint that transformed Russia between 1917 and 1939.

In the wake of the Soviet army came German communists who had received intense schooling in Moscow during the war. Thousands of former Nazis and military officers were recruited into the ranks of the Party and state police to help execute the master plan. With the help of the Russian army, these agents seized control of East German political life. By merging with the Social Democratic Party, which enjoyed a large following, the Communist Party claimed a popular majority, since it controlled the votes of the East German Socialists. The organizational machinery of this new party, known as the Socialist Unity Party, brought quick results. Its policies were immediately made public in a document called *Strategy and Tactics,* published in the late summer of 1945:

1. "It is a fact that the proletariat in Germany does not at this moment represent a power factor. To accomplish that remains our task. The Social Democratic Party machinery has been less fully destroyed than ours, as it did not fight Hitler with equal strength. The American occupation force represents the only power factor against which opposition would be a senseless undertaking. Consequently, the proletarian revolution, the dictatorship of the proletariat is not a current matter. We must first create a jumping-off place, our path must be covered step-by-step."
2. "What do Strategy and Tactics mean? Strategy is the forever immovable outlined battle plan toward the final goal: destruction of the capitalist suppres-

sion state, dictatorship of the proletariat, Socialism and a classless society. Tactics means the operation of single battles and skirmishes, necessary in order to reach a strategic goal. These are not all necessarily steps forward; often we must retreat, engage in flank side operations, or remain static . . .

"Today's tactics require mobilization of all anti-fascist forces in the battle for the nearest momentary goal, which is understandable to all and common to all. In this movement it is quite proper to have Social Democrats or bourgeois in leading positions. If we succeed in keeping this movement going, then we communists as the most active, determined and adaptable, will in due course succeed in obtaining the lead."

In order to build such a state, the communists took some well-calculated steps.

First, they mobilized the East German Youth. Disbanding the Nazi Youth organizations, they immediately supplanted them with communist counterparts. School curricula were similarly reorientated and a major step of Sovietization began: universal "political education," that is, indoctrination. Using a catechismic approach, teachers drilled children in Marxist-Leninism hoping to educate a new generation steeped in communism. This first generation now forms the hard core of the East German communist cadres.

Secondly, the communists enforced a revolutionary land reform. The large estates of Saxony, Brandenburg, Mecklenburg, and Thuringia were dissolved and redistributed. The popularity of this move soon faded as the farmers became victims of harsh taxation, arbitrary price controls, and impossible quotas. Thus the communists readied 6,700,000 acres for their next move, collectivization. In July 1952, orders were given to consolidate, i.e., collectivize, the small farms. By 1957, 40% of the peasants had been organized. Early in 1960, concentrated efforts to complete collectivization were renewed. Individual resistance has been strong, but judging from reports, the farmer has little choice. Despite encouragement from the Lutheran

Church to refuse orders, the farmer remains helpless against the pressures the regime can impose on him. Since the farmer is unable to organize, his back is to the wall. Under communism, capitulation is merely a matter of time.

Thirdly, the trade unions and private industry suffered the same fate. On January 4, 1946, the Free German Trade Union Federation came under communist domination, and the unions were organized according to Marxist-Leninist principles. Wages and hours were standardized and a system of quotas and bonuses goaded each worker on to higher production. Meanwhile the communists were nationalizing industry. Having already seized East German industry in 1945, the Russians returned it, not to its original owner, but to the German communists. Thus, the vital East German metal, heavy machinery, railroad, and chemical industries, its coal and uranium mines, its cement works, and several I. G. Farben branch industries were maneuvered into communist control.

Although until 1949 it looked as if exploitation were the primary objective of the Russian conquerors, the next four years removed all doubts. Having helped rejuvenate the war-shattered industries of the Soviet economy, East Germany in turn now received aid from the Soviet Union, and East Germany's economy quickly expanded. East German industry was rapidly geared to the Soviet bloc and disassociated from West Germany. Now eleven lears later, East German industry is a well-integrated part of the communist economy. An overwhelming percentage of its trade is with the communist world, over 11% with Afro-Asian Nations, but almost none elsewhere. So subservient is it to Moscow's dictates, that, for example, East Germany must buy from Egypt more cotton than her industries require, selling the surplus to the Soviet Union. So dependent is she on Russia that she looks to that country for her oil supplies, grain imports and other strategic raw materials without which her economy would collapse. East Germany is now eastern orientated, now having industries that duplicate those in West Germany, rather than complement them.

What has happened to the intellectuals, however, best illustrates the price of communism. Using the denazifica-

tion process as a front, the communists carefully screened them, sifting out all "dangerous elements." Not only Nazis, but "bourgeois reactionaries" were purged. All teachers, artists, priests, writers, and journalists were carefully sorted out. Those who remained became docile servants of the state, spokesmen for Marxist ideology, builders of a new atheistic culture. Thus, free thought was curbed and intellectual life was stifled.

In 1949, the iron curtain was beginning to isolate East Germany, and by 1953, the foundations of a new German state had been laid. Communication with the West was severely restricted; a new currency was issued; and an East German constitution was put into effect. Thus East Germany was systematically separated from the West. The former East German states were reorganized into fourteen administrative districts, and in 1952, the German Democratic Republic was established, with its own government. To complete the process of separation, East Germany was forced in 1955 to sign the *Warsaw Pact,* Russia's answer to NATO. With this, East Germany was socially, economically, militarily, and diplomatically incorporated into the Communist bloc.

Behind the East German government stands the Red Army, assisted by the National People's Army, which was founded in 1956 as a counter to West German rearmament. Although there have been noble uprisings, such as those in Berlin, their failure is tragic proof of the helplessness of the East German population. Only a few years after Hitler, it finds itself again under the yoke of totalitarianism. Like Russian citizens, East Germans have to submit to a gigantic state machinery backed by a huge army.

Sovietization continues with varying success throughout the Balkans and, with particular ruthlessness, in China and Tibet. Once it has won supremacy, communism seeks, at all costs, to create a new society, and the process of Sovietization then, as quickly as possible, wipes out all traces of the past.

2. FOREIGN AID AND TRADE AS POLITICAL WEAPONS.

In 1955, the Soviet Union initiated a concerted drive to expand its economic relations with the rest of the world. Until that time, this had been a field of activity relatively unexploited by the Soviet Union. Under Stalin, Russia had stayed out of large-scale international economics, since Stalin perferred a policy of isolation. But with the advent of Khrushchev, this policy was reversed, and Russia has since become a major source of aid to underdeveloped regions and a willing buyer of surplus goods. As the communist economic network began to rival that of the United States, it became obvious that this expansion was actually a thinly disguised maneuver of international communism. Since the communists had reduced military activity as the western policy of containment strengthened, they turned to trade and foreign aid as a new avenue of expansion and infiltration.

Their generous offers of credits at low interest, technicians, machinery, and military aid found eager recipients. Underdeveloped regions desperately in need of industry, small, one-product nations whose economy relied on export, and countries that looked for weapons to secure political stability and quell internal strife, all welcomed the opportunity of Soviet assistance. Though none was naive enough to discount the possible consequences of dealing with the Soviet Union, many felt it was worth the risk and remained confident that they could resist communist advances. Everyone knew that the Soviet Union was not charitably extending economic aid or innocently seeking trade, but very few actually realized the serious consequences of establishing economic relationships with the Soviet Union.

In speech after speech, Khrushchev has tried to soothe the fears of the world by stressing the Soviet Union's good

intentions. "When we grant economic aid or technical assistance to a country, we do this as friends, without imposing our terms." To the Arab world he denied any ulterior motives, saying that the Soviet Union "renders disinterested assistance." To Brazil, which is receiving industrial equipment and technological aid, he said that all was given "on a commercial basis . . . without any political strings." And, as a matter of policy, Khrushchev made it known that "the Soviet Union is in sympathy with all nations seeking to safeguard their right to independent development."

It is this last statement that gives Khrushchev away. While promoting independence, the Soviet Union bombards the young and underdeveloped countries with warnings of "American imperialism," cautioning them about "the colonial policies of the capitalists." The Soviet Union, on the other hand, promises not to interfere in their struggle for "economic independence" and "liberation from western imperialism." By fanning the flames of "anti-colonialism" the Soviet Union hopes to become the champion of the non-industrialized world. Pointing to its own brilliant successes, communist Russia has partly convinced many political leaders that communism has much to offer as a fast way to industrialization and economic stability.

Egypt, perhaps the most widely publicized case of communist economic penetration, shows the price of linking ones economy with that of the Soviet Union. Since 1954 Egypt's exports to the Sino-Soviet bloc have risen from 14% of her total exports to over 50% in 1960. Because of the Suez Crisis, Egypt found herself with a sharply curtailed cotton market. The advent of communist offers to buy her cotton was Egypt's salvation. Nasser was delighted by the high prices paid by the communists. But it was not long before the rumor began to circulate that the cotton was being resold on the world market for less. Slowly Egypt began to lose buyers. Unable to prevent this turn of events because she had committed her cotton crops for several years, Egypt has had to watch helplessly. When the agreement expires, Egypt will have no choice but to continue selling to the communists, unless she finds a new market, which is unlikely.

Nasser's obsession with Israel has encouraged him to revamp Egypt's army. Failing to secure arms from the U.S. and Europe, he negotiated with the Soviet Union for arms, agreeing to exchange approximately $200,000,000 worth of cotton. In 1958, unable to get funds from the World Bank to construct the Aswan Dam, Nasser again turned to the U.S.S.R. Russia immediately promised to provide 400 million rubles ($100 million) at a comparatively low rate of interest (2.5%); another 1958 agreement gave Egypt 700 million rubles in credit for spinning mills and mining equipment, which resulted in the entrance of hundreds of Soviet bloc technicians who are also trained communist agents.

By 1960, Egypt had become partially dependent upon the communist bloc, which virtually controls her foreign exchange earnings, and forces her more and more to buy from communist countries, further isolating her from the rest of the world. Equipped with weapons manufactured in Eastern Europe, Egypt must look to the communists for replacements, spare parts, and ammunition.

Despite Nasser's anti-communist measures in Egypt, his political future rests in part with the communists, for they are in a position to disturb the nation's economy. A crisis could lead to another revolution, one that might overthrow Nasser. His political, economic, and military policies, are not yet in the hands of the communists, but they can be steered by remote control. If not a satellite, Egypt is a semi-colony of the communists. Although Nasser has demonstrated his determination to keep communism out, he has nevertheless been caught up in the economic web spun by the communists. Though the communists do not yet have political control, they have won one victory that could easily lead to political domination. A potential fifth column permeates the country; besides the underground communist party, there are hundreds of "technical advisors" and Arabs who have studied in the Soviet Union. As recent reports indicate, Arab students in the Soviet Union receive more ideological indoctrination than technical training. Since Egypt is the center of the most unstable political region of the world, she is fertile ground for communism.

Every country accepting Soviet aid faces the same situation. Cuba, recently placed in a predicament similar to Egypt's, was wooed and won by Russia's traveling "salesman" Mikoyan, who siphoned off Cuba's sugar surplus in exchange for arms. Though the actual degree of communist infiltration in Cuba has not yet been officially determined, there is little doubt that its agents are deeply entrenched. On the African continent, the newly created state of Ghana was quickly attracted to offers from Russia. In 1957, the year of Ghana's independence, the Soviet bloc absorbed 76 million rubles worth of cocoa, Ghana's major product. By buying 34,000 tons (19% of the total export) the communists virtually saved Ghana from political collapse. Again, premium prices were paid when prices were very low. But that same year, no Soviet exports reached Ghana, indicating an unhealthy situation, which continues to become more acute. Guinea shows the same symptoms: 80% of its trade is with the Soviet bloc. It has already received $35 million in credits from the Soviet Union to finance several projects managed by communist engineers and technicians.

Such examples reveal the political nature of Soviet trade and aid, which ignore world prices, purposely creating further instability. Exploiting the weaker nations, the Soviet Union entices them, by buying at a loss, obviously willing to shoulder financial loss for the sake of political gain. One sees just how insidious its economic program is when he realizes that the Soviet Union exports wheat, (which it really cannot afford to sell since its own agricultural yields are scanty), and buys cotton that it does not need! It cancels shipments of oranges from Israel, even though it has a ready market for them. But Soviet strategists feel it more important to obstruct Israel's economy, for the same reasons that they dumped tin on the world market, artificially causing a depression in tin prices, thereby inciting a panic in Bolivia. One is forced to conclude, therefore, that the communists do not operate according to the normal economic principles of profit and loss, but along political lines, whose purpose is to disrupt the normal trade relations of the world.

These examples bring the following words of Khrushchev to mind: "Our economic relations are not based on mutual advantages . . . Our aid is even unprofitable to us . . . However, there does exist a profit of a kind . . . It consists in the fact that by extending economic aid we thereby create conditions for those countries to free themselves from colonial slavery, and not have to agree to an enslaving bargain with colonialists." Trade and foreign aid are just another way of continuing the revolutionary struggle. In the words of Lenin "the proletariat of the advanced countries can and must assist the toiling masses." It is all part of the communist world revolution, one form of colonialism superseding another in the form of communist economic infiltraton.

3. THE SOVIET EMBASSY: HEADQUARTERS FOR ESPIONAGE.

The third sphere of communist activity is in the Soviet embassies. In most nations one can find a Russian Embassy, through which the Soviet Union transacts its business. The purpose of an embassy is to facilitate intergovernmental communications, but, the Soviet Union has extended this meaning. The Soviet Embassy deals individually with three groups separately, one of which is the government of the country in which it is stationed. The officials sent by the Soviet Union, besides acting as representatives of the U.S.S.R., also serve as liaison officers between the Russian Communist Party and other national communist parties; at the same time they act as agents of the Soviet intelligence corps, conducting a large-scale espionage program. Since they are working in the environment they have pledged to destroy, they behave like enemy agents in hostile territory. This not only makes diplomatic procedure difficult but destroys normal diplomatic relations. The triple function of the Soviet diplomat makes the Embassy a headquarters for communism on foreign soil.

As soon as the Communists came to power, they began to practice a new concept of diplomacy, to which the rest of the world still has not accustomed itself. They conceived diplomacy as a means of furthering communist ends, that is, fostering revolution and working against international harmony. Order was the last thing the communists wanted; dissent and internal strife were their goals, and diplomacy was a way to incite disorder in the non-communist world. Totally contradicting its usual definition, they made diplomacy part of the strategy of world communism.

Though the Kremlin denies that it is used, interference in internal affairs is the primary object of the ambassadors sent by the Soviet Union. The founding of the Comintern

in 1919 should have served to warn the world. This "international revolutionary proletarian organization" dedicated to waging "a determined struggle for the dictatorship of the proletariat and for the triumph of Soviets all over the world" was put into effect parallel with the diplomatic corps that established international relations. This organization kept in touch with the various national communist parties and directed their activities. Though it has since been dissolved, its function has been taken over by the embassies. Two instruments of subversion, the Foreign Commissariat and the Comintern, were merged into one. The end of the Comitern in no way meant a change in policy.

The role of the communist parties is extremely baffling. Clearly they are a contradiction. How can men who profess an aversion to parliamentary procedure participate in a democratic government? What can be their objective? And what policy do they follow? What is their significance?

In France and Italy, the communists are a prominent group. Since they function in a multi-party system, they are in a key position. These governments that must depend on coalitions for their majority strength are often forced to compromise with smaller groups. In order to build up a working majority, they recruit the minorities. Often, these smaller parties are communist influenced. In fact, in Italy and France, the communists have partially controlled the life-span of several cabinets, either by refusing their vote of confidence or by persuading others to leave the coalition. This makes for unstable rule which the communists exploit. Though the instability of coalition governments is not the fault of the communists, it is purposely aggravated by them, for they see in it an ideal opportunity to undermine the efficiency of democratic procedure. A glance at their voting record immediately shows that they are present merely to disrupt, and not to promote a positive policy. They are likely to support socialists as well as ultranationalists. Whatever their vote, it is always to Moscow's advantage and at the expense of democracy. Only recently, the attempts to form a government in Italy showed the danger of having communist parties within the democratic framework. The center parties, finding that they were re-

ceiving little support from the right, were forced to turn to the socialists who had pledged themselves to the communists. This shows that it is foolish to tolerate legal communist parties.

The temporary alliances encouraged by the communist parties are not signs of compromise but expediencies to promote their ends. As Stalin explained in 1925, the task of the communist parties is "to support the Soviet power and foil the interventionalist machinations of the imperialists against the Soviet Union, . . . mainstay of the revolutionary movement in all countries." As explained in the *Communist Manifesto,* they are the vanguards of the revolution in each country and, as such, they ally themselves with other groups to increase their influence. Any alliance is permitted, said Stalin, as long as it does not "hinder the Communist Party from conducting its independent political work."

Besides encouraging the "legal" subversive role of the communist parties, the embassies direct an underground movement whose major purpose is to steal government secrets. J. Edgar Hoover warned, "Experience has revealed that foreign espionage agents seek the protection of legal cover . . . They seek admittance . . . on diplomatic passports . . . and . . . thus conceal themselves under the cloak of diplomatic immunity." He points out that with the assistance of satellite embassies, these men have infiltrated every branch of American government.

A study of the backgrounds of the men sent by the Soviet Union to serve in its embassies has proved the intentions of the Soviet Foreign Office. Many are former M.V.D. personnel with almost no diplomatic experience. In 1951, of 100 communists attached to the United Nations and other communist embassies, 32 had been "engaged in active work for the intelligence services of their respective countries;" 21 had participated in "Communist organizational work of an underground or subversive nature outside their homeland;" in the U.S., 29 had been involved in subversive activities investigated by the Central Intelligence Agency. According to Pamfil Riposanu, a former member of the Rumanian Legation, "the Communist gov-

ernments . . . use everyone,—not diplomats, every person, every chauffeur, every man sent here,—for espionage and propaganda." These men contact State Department employees and anyone else who can lead them to information about the U.S. The list of diplomatic aids classified as persons non grata includes air, naval, and military attaches who have abused their diplomatic immunity. The case of Harry Gold, the Rosenbergs, and Klaus Fuchs, illustrates that these agents can even gain access to such carefully guarded secrets as the atom bomb.

But the United States is not the only victim of diplomatic espionage. Investigations in Canada uncovered a network of communist agents, operating on an annual budget of over $20 million. Australian authorities were recently shocked to find a communist spy ring directed by their own Russian Embassy. Not even children are safe from these terrorists, who kidnapped the two and a half year old daughter of a refugee to coerce him to return to the Soviet Union.

What we must understand is that the communists are enemy agents. According to Lenin, "The communists have declared war on the world." Consequently, they have no scruples about violating any law. Their duty is to undermine the free world. If one emissary is expelled, he is replaced by another and their work continues.

The communists demonstrated their deceit in 1956 by the arrest of Imra Nagy as he emerged from the Yugoslavian legation with a promise of safe passage. Thus, operating on every conceivable level, they continue to confirm the "war to the hilt" policy preached in 1930 by D. Z. Manuilsky at the Lenin School of Political Warfare, destroying the concept of diplomatic immunity and stripping diplomacy of all accepted meanings.

4. THE ART OF SUMMITRY: GLOBAL DECEPTION.

The summit conferences have focused world attention on the struggle between East and West; here communism spars with the other major powers. The "cold war" is best personified by these meetings, as the Soviet Union negotiates with England, France, and the United States. This is the fourth sphere of communist activity, the field of diplomatic relations, perhaps the most important. For if communism wins the battle of the summit, it will not be far from attaining world domination. That is why the world follows the progress of the summit conferences so closely. The world looks on them as tests of strength in which the free world pits itself against the aggressive Soviet Union.

Though it was Churchill who coined the term "summit," the custom of settling international disputes by top-level negotiation extends back to the early nineteenth century. Throughout the century, a popular method of resolving international tensions had been the "congress" system. For a hundred years, the rulers of Europe were able to stave off a repetition of the Napoleonic wars that had ravaged Europe for twenty years. Not until 1914 was Europe engulfed by a similar holocaust. Consequently, after such international bodies as the Hague Peace Conference and the League of Nations had failed to prevent World Wars I and II, the major powers naturally were skeptical when the United Nations was organized to preserve world peace. Instead of turning their problems over to the United Nations, the powers returned to top-level conferences, hoping they could bargain effectively and maintain a tolerable status quo.

Unfortunately the fruit of the summits has been bitter. Instead of creating world harmony, they seem to add to the steadily mounting tensions that threaten a new World War. Rather than bridging the gaps separating the major powers, they tend to widen the gulf. Most of all, they dem-

onstrate the unwillingness of the communists to lessen international disunity. Nonchalantly, they ignore previous agreements and aggravate new crises that lead to more summit meetings. Although so far there has been no tangible evidence of communist good will, the West continues to accept invitations to such conferences. The speedy evaporation of the "spirit of Camp David" should have been sufficient indication of what was to become of the May conference.

Since the signing of the *Atlantic Charter,* the Soviet Union has, without exception, broken most major agreements made at the summits. The *Atlantic Charter* signatories promised that:

> "First, their countries seek no aggrandizement, territorial or other."

The Soviet acquisition of the Baltic States and territories previously belonging to Poland, Czechoslovakia, and Rumania is a flagrant violation of this clause.

> "Second, they desire to see no territorial changes that do not accord with the freely expressed wishes of the people concerned."

No elections were held in Eastern Europe to gain the consent of the people whose lands were annexed.

> "Third, they respect the right of all peoples to choose the form of government under which they will live; and they wish to see sovereign rights and self-government restored to those who have been forcibly deprived of them."

This clause was violated without exception by the Soviet Union when it helped mold the East European satellites.

The agreements made at Potsdam about Germany's occupation have almost been forgotten. The Soviet Union's creation of East Germany and its continual complication of the Berlin affair have clouded over the original decisions. The Geneva Conference in 1955 also demonstrates the Soviet lack of respect for these meetings. While the powers were in conference, the Soviet Union penetrated the Near East, and communists won key positions in the Syrian army. A year later, Radio Moscow intensified its propaganda, in-

citing the Arabs to fight for their honor and liberate themselves from "the colonal powers," at the same time as the foreign ministers were trying to solve the Suez crisis.

So perplexed were the Western leaders, that President Eisenhower wrote to Premier Bulganin, "I must confess that I am perplexed as to how we can work together constructively if agreements which are negotiated at the highest level after the most thorough explanation do not seem dependable." Still more desperate are the words of Senator James O. Eastland, who, as chairman of the Internal Security Subcommittee, once said: "You must be a liar, a cheat, and probably a spy before you can represent a communist nation in international diplomacy. You must have no more regard for honor when you sign an agreement on behalf of your country, than a forger does when he puts a name on a check."

The treachery of the communists, though resembling gangsterism, is perfectly consistent with Marxist-Leninist ideology. Lenin set the tone of Soviet diplomatic morality when he described the Brest-Litovsk Peace Treaty as "an agreement in the interest of socialism." When the decision is no longer expedient to the communists, then it is broken. One must not, Lenin added, "tie one's hands with considerations of formality." As Zinoviev quite unashamedly admitted, "Treaties are made to be broken;" the legacy of broken agreements since 1917 is the best testimonial to his words. But nothing is clearer than Stalin's blunt description:

> "Words must have no relations to actions—otherwise what kind of diplomacy is it? Words are one thing, actions another. Good words are a mask for concealment of bad deeds. Sincere diplomacy is no more possible than dry water or wooden iron."

With this before us in black and white, can we possibly believe that men sign for the Soviet Union in good faith?

The May summit, which was Khrushchev-instigated, had on its agenda disarmament, another creation of Khrushchev's to join with his two previous inventions, "coexistence" and "peaceful competition." Everyone, even Khrush-

chev, knows that disarmament is a practical impossibility. It has never been achieved in the past, and the Soviet refusal to accept disarmament with inspection makes it clear that the communists have no intention of laying down their arms. Like everyone else, they know that military strength is the loudest voice at the conference table, and that without it one could not negotiate. Consequently, one is forced to come to the conclusion that the summits of the future will resemble those of the past. Agreements might be made; but they will be broken. The communists continue to make a mockery of top-level meetings, indiscriminately raising and dashing the hopes of the world.

RESUME.

As one looks upon the communist world movement, one cannot but become aware of its grand unity. Every single detail of communist activity works towards one end, namely, Soviet aggrandizement. One must stand in awe before its relentlessness. Like a flow of lava it creeps forward. If something arises in its path, it surrounds and engulfs it. Every party member is conscious of the idea of world revolution. Wherever he finds himself, he works towards this goal. Looking to the Soviet Union for leadership and support, he has only one idea in mind, a Soviet Empire.

Because the communists first found a foothold in Russia, it became their base of operations. "History has given us . . . the honorable role of the vanguard of the international socialist revolution," said Lenin. Not until the revolution had reached all the corners of the world could there be any rest for the Party. "The final victory of socialism in a single country is impossible," he warned. As Stalin pointed out in 1924, "The victory of socialism in one country is not a self-sufficient task. The revolution which has been victorious in one country must regard itself . . . as . . . . a means for hastening the victory of the proletariat in all countries." Four years later, he concluded, "The U.S.S.R. becomes the base of the world movement . . . the center of international revolution." This concept of Russia as a territorial headquarters is still adhered to by Khrushchev, who has not lost sight of the terminal point of communism. "We have retained a great revolutionary spirit . . . We shall always be true to the principle of proletarian internationalism." Consequently, until the final goal of total control has been achieved, the "permanent revolution" preached by Trotsky goes on. As Khrushchev solemnly recalled in 1958, "The slogan proclaimed by Marx, 'Workers of the World, Unite!' is a sacred motto for us."

The march of communism is the fundamental reality of our age. Throughout the world, the pulse of communist dynamism can be felt. The closer a society is to the heart of communism, the stronger is the pressure as it pumps new life-blood into it. Each society is exposed to communism, and it might succumb, unless, like any living organism, it can find immunity by building up its resistance. This is the challenge that democracy faces.

CONCLUSION: THE GREAT ASSIGNMENT.

Democracy's historical assignment is of international dimensions. The contest between the principles of freedom and tyranny transcends national barriers. Therefore, the problem confronting the Western strategists is to devise a plan to cope with a movement that leaves no room for compromise, strives for global domination, openly condones subversive action, and espouses a fallacy-ridden ideology. How are they to negotiate with a fanatical enemy, if his favorite weapon is deceit? And, how are they to find the necessary strength to halt and repulse the communist colossus?

For the diplomat, this poses a multitude of problems. He must weigh military, economic, and political factors, whose respective importance fluctuates from day to day He has to maintain a delicate balance of power that often hinges on such intangibles as morale and public opinion, and he must reckon with such uncertain factors as undetermined nuclear strength. This likens world diplomacy to a poker game, each side outguessing and outbluffing the other. The element of surprise has become such a popular device (for example, the attack on Suez by England and France, and the sudden Berlin ultimatum of Krushchev) that world tension is hardly relaxed before another sudden move disturbs the calm. The public has become increasingly sceptical, geared to disappointment while its diplomatic leadership hesitates, uncertain of its strength and that of its opponent.

Our last question is, can communism win? To find the answer, let us briefly examine the relative strengths of the opposing forces. Since 1917, with the Bolshevik rise to power, communism has marched across the Eurasian continent. In 1919, the Soviet Union was given back the huge, rich, western territories it had ceded to Germany the previous year at the Peace of Brest-Litovsk. In 1924, the Bol-

sheviks engineered the Mongolian People's Republic. Twenty years later, after the cataclysmic end of World War II, communism was able to penetrate Europe and Asia more deeply. In the West, the three Baltic States, as well as large sections of pre-war Poland and Finland were annexed by the Soviet Union. In the East, Russia extended its control to include the whole island of Sakhalin. By 1948 Eastern Europe had fallen, and, one year later, the Chinese communist armies conquered China.

Democracy has also made significant advances. Since World War II, three new democratic states have been successfully established. India, Japan, and West Germany are proving that they can thrive without resorting to totalitarian measures. Though burdened by serious social, political, and economic problems, these young democracies have managed to control the voices of extremism, preferring a path of change through parliamentary reform to one of revolution.

Despite the visible gains made by communism and democracy, both have experienced political and military setbacks. In the early twenties, a short-lived communist coup was snuffed out in Bavaria, Germany. After World War II, the Red Army withdrew from Finland and Austria. In Greece, the communists were halted by the Truman Doctrine, and military action stopped them in Korea. Firm diplomacy, backed by military strength, has saved West Berlin and Formosa. A shaky coalition in Kerala, India, is keeping the communists at bay. Yugoslavia has refused Moscow supremacy. Numerous anti-communist demonstrations within the Communist bloc, a flood of refugees, and revolutions in Hungary and Tibet clearly show that the communist empire has its internal weaknesses too.

Nor has democracy's growth always been encouraging. After World War I, it failed in Eastern Europe. In Spain, a revolution led to dictatorship. Furthermore, new nations are not placing complete trust in democratic methods. In order to maintain social harmony and economic stability, Afghanistan, Pakistan, Burma, Indonesia, Ghana, and Guinea are relying more and more upon strong-man and one-party rule, though they have not rejected democracy as

a final goal. And democracy in South America must rely on military cliques. The forces of Nasserism support a dangerous nationalism. But the most serious blow has been the political instability of France.

At a diplomatic cocktail party Khrushchev was overheard saying, "We shall bury you." Whether these were his actual words is not important, for he has expressed the same belief several times. Once he said, "Your grandchildren will live under communism;" and, on another occasion, he said, "History is on our side." Such statements merely confirm the unequivocal communist conviction that its cause will eventually triumph. Communists are unshakably certain of the inevitability of the outcome of the historic struggle. This explains the fanaticism with which they drive their people. Armed with such a strong faith, communists are the most dynamic group in the world, dedicated to overtaking and outproducing the capitalistic industrial nations. To the average observer, the amazing successes within the communist bloc and the pace of its industrial expansion make the assertions of Khrushchev more than an empty boast. In comparison to the less compulsive tempo in the rest of the world, the titanic expenditure of human energy both in the Soviet Union and in China seems to be proof of the fervor that communism is able to instill in its workers. Not only is the rate of progress awesome, but the potentialities for improvement seem boundless. For some time already, Western economists have admitted the possibility of the communist bloc's emerging as the leading industrial complex in the very near future.

In economic terms, this might not be so serious. But translated into political consequences, the development becomes grave, because communism converts all its energy into aggressive policies aimed at the destruction of the noncommunist world. As communism proves its superiority, it will win more and more admirers among the leaders of the underdeveloped countries. These men, who must cope with immense economic problems, are looking for ways to industrialize and are less concerned with political ideology. They have often been discouraged by the unprecedented standard of living in the West. For them, over-abundance

is a secondary goal: first they want to achieve security from famine. Where marginal existence is the lot of millions, the slightest fluctuations of the market can spell untold misery to the masses. Thus, the communist promise of economic stability makes a deeper impression than capitalism with its danger of depression and inflation. First, the leaders of Asia and Africa seek economic stability, then, they argue, abundance will be a natural consequence. For them, extreme wealth has long been a symbol of injustice, and their goal is to narrow the gulf between the rich and the poor. That is why the communist attitude towards economic equality sounds more intelligent to them and has an immediacy lacking in Western promises. Political democracy, they reason, is a hollow phrase that will not fill stomachs. Where daughters are sold into prostitution so the young girls, not the mothers, can secure food, political freedom makes little sense. When humanity is so shackled to economic misery that it is reduced to such indignity, when despair is so extreme, a practicable solution is seized first.

So far, communism is winning this race. Its audience increases daily, as its propaganda inspires the masses and their leaders with hope. Unless the democracies find a way of conveying their message convincingly, Africa and all of Asia will soon fall to communism. Since it can only thrive where there is dissatisfaction and where there is bitter disagreement, the hope for democratic victory in these areas lies in removing the causes of poverty and racial and religious friction. As long as they remain, communism will be able to drive its wedge deeper and deeper.

The Soviet Union, despite two ruinous world wars, has been able to emerge a world power. In China, communist leadership saved a disintegrating society, refashioning it into what will be the leading power in the Far East. In contrast, the United States has grown but slightly and England has shrunk to a secondary power. For the smaller nations seeking security alliances this is an ominous signal. In order to avert the increasing lack of confidence in democracy and capitalism, the West will have to rejuvenate itself and demonstrate its virility. So far, it has only been able to slow the pace of the communist advance. In essence,

its policy has been defensive, and it has not been able to remove new breeding grounds of communism. As the solidarity of the communist empire increases, the lack of unity of the rest of the world becomes more evident. Instead of opposing communism together, the rest of the world is divided by petty jealousies, nationalistic grievances, racial hatred, and religious bias.

Only an international union can hope to resist communism; and a basis for unity will have to be found to fight the common enemy. Overlapping military pacts and inadequate economic agreements will not suffice. North and South Americans, Africans and Asians, Christians and Moslems will have to find a banner under which they can unite. Unless they can agree on a united front, communism will continue to spread over the world. So far, communism's attack on religious faith and intellectual freedom seems to be the only rallying issue for all non-communists.

No one deliberately desires suppression of his ideas. Perhaps the world can be made to realize that herein lies the fundamental danger of communism. Its intolerance towards any form of individuality makes it a general threat. Whether the democracies and the other nations can find the leadership and vision to unite under this or any other principle remains the crucial question. Democracy must find a dynamism that will counter the Messianic drive of the communists. Mankind will have to believe as strongly in freedom as the communists do in tyranny. As long as democracy is willing to compromise with dictators or any other non-democratic forces, it can never win universal respect. Freedom has only been achieved by a relentless desire to preserve and spread the principle of liberty. The road to freedom has never been easy, and the burdens of a free life are often discouraging. But mankind has to decide whether it wishes to live in oppression or freedom.

The communists have only heeded strength, in words or deeds; but strength is the child of unity. The energy of the communist movement must be matched by the determined will of a united democratic citizenry. It must not become despondent in the face of communist successes, nor should its leadership become paralyzed by the military

might of the Soviet Empire. The fight for freedom is a continuous struggle. Communism is only one of the forces that have challenged free men. Nor will this be the last battle. Wherever there are men, tyranny will arise in some form. In many ways, life is the struggle for freedom; and communism is this generation's opportunity to prove that democracy is strong enough to withstand such an opponent.

The present international stalemate is teaching mankind one great lesson about itself: he is dependent. As technological advances become increasingly complex while political wisdom wanes, man is forced to look for help. Unless men learn humility and seek guidance they will either fall into utter despair or commit the cardinal sin of communism, which makes man God.

READING GUIDE

The following books have been selected for their scholarly excellence and their availability. They were written by outstanding authorities, and they will supply the detailed analysis that was purposely avoided in this book. In them will be found lengthy bibliographies as further guides to informative reading. The few books mentioned below are merely a point of departure for those who wish to learn more about communism.

Abraham Brumberg, (ed.), *Communism after Stalin,* Praeger.

John S. Curtiss, *The Russian Church and the Soviet State,* Little, Brown and Co.

David J. Dallin, *The Real Soviet Russia,* Yale.

George B. De Huszar and Associates, *Soviet Power and Policy,* Crowell Co.

Merle Fainsod, *How Russia is Ruled,* Harvard.

Harry Hodgkinson, *The Language of Communism,* Pitman.

Sidney Hook, *Marx and Marxists,* Anvil.

W. W. Rostow, *The Dynamics of Soviet Society,* Mentor.

Hugh Seton-Watson, *From Lenin to Khrushchev,* Praeger.

W. W. Kulski, *The Soviet Regime,* Syracuse.

Published by the *Daughters of St. Paul*

50 St. Paul's Ave., *Jam. Pl., Boston* 30, *Mass.*

By Richard Cardinal Cushing

Questions and Answers on Communism

A book of patent questions and definitive answers; most informative and interesting.

– J. Edgar Hoover, Head of the F.B.I.

A book that should be in every home.

– Louis Budenz

A splendid work, simple and direct, yet with all the profundity and breadth to be found in treatises on the subject. I hope the day soon comes when it will be required in all Catholic colleges and high schools.

– Francis P. McQuade, L.B. Ph.D.,
Ass't. Prof. of Philosophy, Fordham University

We have rarely encountered so much in so little and for so little.

– Homilectic and Pastoral Review

160 pages, $1.00; for 50 or more copies, $.50 each

Daughters of St. Paul
50 St. Paul's Ave., Jam. Plain, Boston 30, Mass.